



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/590,841	08/24/2006	Janne Mikkola	915-001.096	1434
4955	7590	06/18/2009	EXAMINER	
WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP	BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5	755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224	MAPA, MICHAEL Y	
MONROE, CT 06468			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/18/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/590,841	MIKKOLA, JANNE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Mapa	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2009.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-11 and 18-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration on the election with traverse of Group I claims 1-11 and 18-26 in the reply filed on 04/20/09 is acknowledged. The traversal and request for reconsideration is on the ground(s) that the applicant has stated that Group II has basically the same limitations as the other related claims of Group I and that it is so closely related that it would not be an extra burden of any significance for the examiner to examine these Group II claims at the same time and the applicant has stated that the examiner has not explained why there would be a serious burden except to indicate a slight difference in two of the subclasses.

This is not found persuasive because as stated in the previous office action the call diversion process is executed within the mobile station (claims 12-17) and within a mobile switching center (claims 18-23) which falls under two different subclasses. The claims are directed towards two different inventions and would be a serious burden on the examiner since both inventions are directed towards diverging searches (i.e. 455/561 (structural configuration detail of a mobile communication serving site) and 455/550.1 (configuration detail of a transceiver)).

The requirement is still deemed proper and the FINALITY is therefore maintained.

Response to Amendment

2. The applicant has amended the following:

Claims: 1- 23 have been amended.

Claims: 24-26 have not been amended.

Claims: 12-17 are withdrawn from consideration.

With regards to the 101 & 112 rejection on claim 8 from the previous office action, the applicant has amended the claims to overcome the 101 & 112 rejection. Therefore, the examiner withdraws the 101 & 112 rejection on claim 8 from the previous office action.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 04/20/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues features wherein a system and method comprising identifying a data transmitting device from which data is being transmitted to a receiving mobile station and in the case where the data transmitting device is identified as a transmitting device from which there is defined a call divert command to the receiving mobile station, receiving the data, or in the case the data transmitting device is identified as other than the transmitting device from which there is defined a call divert command

Art Unit: 2617

to the receiving mobile station, transmitting the data further, read upon Reding as follows:

Reding discloses a call forwarding system and method wherein a determination is made whether call received has special handling instructions based on the caller-ID by sending a query to the application server to look up the caller-ID in the disposition list, therefore identifying the data transmitting device from which data is being transmitted to a receiving mobile station. Reding discloses ringing the home phone when a particular contact is calling or forwarding the call to the user's cell phone, therefore when the data transmitting device is identified as a transmitting device from which there is a defined a call divert command to the receiving mobile station receiving the data. Reding discloses that the user may elect for the home phone to ring or to forward the call to a specific phone or vacation number as a default in the event that no specific treatment is specified, therefore in the case the data transmitting device is identified as other than the transmitting device from which there is a defined call divert command from the receiving mobile station (no specific treatment specified), transmitting the data further (use default treatment such as forwarding the call to a particular number).

With regards to the applicants arguments that Reding's disclosure of transmitting of the data further is carried out in both cases by defined call divert commands which have no relation to a case where the data transmitting device is identified as other than the transmitting device from which there is defined a call divert command to the receiving mobile station, the examiner respectfully disagrees. As stated above and the

arguments provided below, Reding discloses having a specific treatment for numbers in the disposition list as well as having a default treatment such as forwarding to a specific number for numbers not on the disposition list, therefore transmitting the data further in the case that the data transmitting device is identified as other than the transmitting device from which there is a defined call divert command to the receiving mobile station.

Therefore, the argued limitations read upon the cited references or are written broad such that they read upon the cited references, as follows:

Specification

4. The amendment filed 04/20/09 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: "The processing unit 206 can have a computer readable medium" (Page 10, Line 1).

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities: The applicant has failed to provide the correct identifier. The identifier for claim 15 states "(previously presented)" instead of the correct identifier of "(currently amended)."

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The applicant has amended claims 24-26 to state "a computer-readable storage medium", however the specification does not state or provide description on "a computer-readable storage medium", therefore claims 24-26 are new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

8. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

9. Claims 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

With regards to claims 24-26, the applicant has claimed “computer readable storage medium”, however, the applicant has not provided a description on what the “computer readable storage medium” entails in the specification, therefore claims 24-26 falls under non-statutory subject matter. For the purpose of the examination and the rejection provided below, the examiner will interpret “computer readable storage medium” to be statutory and not have a 101 rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11. Claims 1-2, 4, 6-8 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Reding et al. (US Patent Publication 2004/0156491 herein after referenced as Reding).

Regarding claim 1, Reding discloses “A method comprising: identifying a data transmitting device from which data is being transmitted to a receiving mobile station”
(Fig. 8 & Paragraphs [0114] – [0115] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses

receiving a call and determining if special handling based on caller-ID should be applied and sending a query to the application server to look up the caller-ID in the disposition list). Reding discloses “and in case the data transmitting device is identified as a transmitting device, from which there is defined a call divert command to the receiving mobile station, receiving the data, or in case the data transmitting device is identified as other than the transmitting device, from which there is defined a call divert command to the receiving mobile station, transmitting the data further” (**Paragraph [0121] & [0117] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses calls to their home phone from a particular user will ring the home phone, therefore receiving the data when the transmitting device is identified as the transmitting mobile station with a defined call divert command, as well as disclosing forwarding the call to a particular number if no specific treatment is specified, therefore the transmitting device is identified as other than the transmitting device and transmitting the data further).**

Regarding claim 2, Reding discloses “A method according to claim 1, wherein the transmitting device, from which data is being transmitted to the receiving mobile station, is identified by a network device before transmitting the data to the receiving mobile station, and the receiving mobile station is selected according to the identified data transmitting device by said network device” (**Fig. 8 & Paragraphs [0114] – [0116] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses receiving a call which is then routed by the network to the SSP and ISCP and the ISCP determining if special handling based on the caller-ID should be applied and wherein a query is sent to the application**

server to look up the caller-ID in the disposition list to retrieve the instructions on how to handle the call such as forwarding to a particular number of a mobile phone, therefore a network device).

Regarding claim 4, Reding discloses “A system comprising: a transmitter for transmitting data from a transmitting mobile station to a receiving mobile station as a response to a call divert command in the transmitting mobile station” (**Fig. 8 & Paragraphs [0038] & [0116] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses the invention using mobile phones and forwarding the call (transmitting data) to a particular number if the calling party is specified in the disposition list to forward the calls, therefore a transmitter**). Reding discloses “a processor configured to identify a data transmitting device from which data is being transmitted to the receiving mobile station” (**Fig. 8 & Paragraphs [0040] & [0114] – [0115] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses the CPU providing the control and processing functions having a processor and receiving a call and determining if special handling based on caller-ID should be applied and sending a query to the application server to look up the caller-ID in the disposition list**). Reding discloses “a receiver for receiving data in the receiving mobile station, in case the data transmitting device is identified as the transmitting mobile station, from which data, according to the call divert command, is transmitted to the receiving mobile station” (**Paragraph [0121] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses calls to their home phone from a particular user will ring the home phone, therefore a receiver for receiving the data when the transmitting device is identified as the transmitting mobile station with a defined call divert command**).

Reding discloses “and a further transmitter for transmitting data further to a predetermined receiving device, in case the data transmitting mobile station is identified as other than the transmitting mobile station from which data, according to the call divert command, is transmitted to the receiving mobile station” (**Paragraph [0117] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses a default handling treatment of forwarding the call to a particular number if no specific treatment is specified, therefore a further transmitter in the case of the transmitting mobile station is identified as other than a mobile station with a specified call divert command**).

Regarding claim 6, Reding discloses “A system according to claim 4, wherein said processor is configured to redefine receiver information of the transmitted data based on predefined receiver information, as a response to identifying the data transmitting device as other than the transmitting mobile station, from which data, according to the call divert command, is transmitted to the receiving mobile station” (**Paragraphs [0040] & [0117] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses a default handling treatment of forwarding the call to a particular number (predefined receiver) if no specific treatment is specified, therefore a processor configured to redefine receiver information in the case of the transmitting mobile station is identified as other than a mobile station with a specified call divert command**).

Regarding claim 7, Reding discloses “A system according to claim 4, wherein said processor is configured to redefine the receiver information based on data type, according to predetermined instructions, as a response to identifying the data transmitting device as other than the transmitting mobile station from which data,

according to the call divert command, is transmitted to the receiving mobile station”
(Paragraphs [0040] & [0090] & [0117] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses a default handling treatment of forwarding the call to a particular number (predefined receiver) if no specific treatment is specified as well as disclosing SMS messages addressed to their home phone number directed to an SMS capable device, therefore a processor configured to redefine receiver information based on data type in the case of the transmitting mobile station is identified as other than a mobile station with a specified call divert command).

Regarding claim 8, Reding discloses “A computer readable medium having a transmitting element, identifying element, receiving element and further transmitting elements are a computer program stored thereon for carrying out the method of claim 1”
(Paragraph [0125] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses the system and method of the invention to be stored on computer readable media. See arguments for claim 1).

Regarding claim 23, Reding discloses “A computer-readable storage medium encoded with instructions that, when executed by a computer, perform processing data for transmission as a response to detecting a call divert command”
(Paragraph [0125] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses the system and method of the invention to be stored on computer readable media). Reding discloses “identifying a data transmitting device” (Fig. 8 & Paragraphs [0114] – [0115] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses receiving a call and determining if special handling based on caller-ID should be applied and sending a query to the

application server to look up the caller-ID in the disposition list). Reding discloses “transmitting data to a receiving mobile station according to the call divert command, in case the data transmitting device is identified as a transmitting device from which data, according to the call divert command, is transmitted to the receiving mobile station”

(Paragraph [0121] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses calls to their home phone from a particular user will ring the home phone, therefore transmitting data to the receiving mobile station when the transmitting device is identified as the transmitting mobile station with a defined call divert command). Reding discloses “and transmitting data to a predetermined receiving device, in case the data transmitting device is identified as other than the transmitting device from which data, according to the call divert command, is transmitted to the receiving mobile station”

(Paragraph [0117] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses a default handling treatment of forwarding the call to a particular number if no specific treatment is specified, therefore a transmitting data to a predetermined receiving device in the case of the transmitting mobile station is identified as other than a mobile station with a specified call divert command).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 9-11, 18, 20-22 and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reding et al. (US Patent Publication 2004/0156491 herein after referenced as Reding).

Regarding claim 9, Reding discloses “A system according to claim 4, wherein the system is a mobile communication network” (**Paragraph [0033] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses a cellular network**).

Reding fails to explicitly disclose “and that the system is located in a message center or a mobile switching center, or both.”

Reding discloses a voice network plane to include the SSP, ISCP and mobile switching center (**Paragraph [0091] of Reding**).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Reding to incorporate all the elements into a mobile switching center for the purpose of saving network resources by consolidating the elements into a single apparatus such as a mobile switching center.

Regarding claim 10, Reding discloses “A system according to claim 4, wherein the system is a communication network” (**Paragraph [0033] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses a cellular network**).

Reding fails to explicitly disclose “and the system is located in a network gateway bus.”

Reding discloses a voice network plane to include the SSP, ISCP and mobile switching center (**Paragraph [0091] of Reding**) as well as disclosing being connected by a direct connection (**Paragraph [0085] of Reding**).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Reding to incorporate all the elements into a network gateway bus for the purpose of saving network resources by consolidating the elements into a single apparatus such as a network gateway bus.

Regarding claim 11, Reding discloses “A system according to claim 4, wherein the system is a communication network, and that system is located in a network terminal device.” The examiner rejects claim 11 with the same arguments provided above (see claim 9).

Regarding claim 18, Reding discloses “a processor configured to: detect a call divert command” (**Fig. 8 & Paragraphs [0038] & [0040] & [0116] of Reding**, wherein **Reding discloses the invention comprising a CPU that provides control and processing functions having a processor and using mobile phones and forwarding the call (transmitting data) to a particular number if the calling party is specified in the disposition list to forward the calls, therefore detecting a call divert command**). Reding discloses “identify a data transmitting device from which data is transmitted to a receiving mobile station” (**Fig. 8 & Paragraphs [0114] – [0115] of Reding**, wherein **Reding discloses receiving a call and determining if special handling based on caller-ID should be applied and sending a query to the application server to look up the caller-ID in the disposition list**). Reding discloses

“transmit data to the receiving mobile station, in case the data transmitting device is identified as the transmitting device from which data, according to the call divert command, is transmitted to the receiving mobile station” (**Paragraph [0121] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses calls to their home phone from a particular user will ring the home phone, therefore a transmitting element for transmitting the data to the receiving mobile station when the transmitting device is identified as the transmitting mobile station with a defined call divert command**). Reding discloses “and transmit data to a predetermined receiving device, in case the data transmitting device is identified as other than the transmitting device from which data, according to the call divert command, is transmitted to the receiving mobile station” (**Paragraph [0117] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses a default handling treatment of forwarding the call to a particular number if no specific treatment is specified, therefore a transmitting in the case of the transmitting mobile station is identified as other than a mobile station with a specified call divert command**).

Reding fails to explicitly disclose “A mobile switching center” comprising all the elements above. However Reding discloses a voice network plane that includes a mobile switching center and the elements stated above (**Paragraph [0091] of Reding**).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Reding to incorporate all the elements into a mobile switching center for the purpose of saving network resources by consolidating the elements into a single apparatus such as a mobile switching center.

Regarding claim 20, Reding discloses "A mobile switching center according to claim 18, wherein the processor is configured to redefine data receiver information as a response to identifying the data transmitting device as other than the transmitting device from which data, according to the call divert command, is transmitted to the receiving mobile station, and to reroute_transmitted data to a redefined receiving device"

(Paragraphs [0040] & [0117] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses a default handling treatment of forwarding the call to a particular number (redefined receiving device) if no specific treatment is specified, therefore redefining data receiver information and rerouting transmitted data to a redefined receiving device, in the case of the transmitting mobile station is identified as other than a mobile station with a specified call divert command).

Regarding claim 21, Reding discloses "A mobile switching center according to claim 20, wherein said processor is configured to establish an active connection between the other transmitting device and the redefined receiving device" **(Paragraph [0117] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses a default handling treatment of forwarding the call to a particular number (redefined receiving device) if no specific treatment is specified, therefore once the call is forwarded to the particular number and the user answers the call at the particular number an active connection is established).**

Regarding claim 22, Reding discloses "A mobile switching center according to claim 18, wherein said processor is configured to transmit a given data entity to the receiving device" **(Paragraphs [0121] & [0090] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses**

having the calls (data entity) to their home phone from a particular contact ring the home phone as well as disclosing sms messages (data entity) being sent to an SMS capable device of the users choosing).

Regarding claim 24, Reding discloses “A computer-readable storage medium according to claim 23.” The examiner rejects claim 24 with the same arguments provided above (see claim 9).

Regarding claim 25, Reding discloses “A computer-readable storage medium according to claim 23.” The examiner rejects claim 25 with the same arguments provided above (see claim 10).

Regarding claim 26, Reding discloses “A computer-readable storage medium according to claim 23.” The examiner rejects claim 26 with the same arguments provided above (see claim 11).

14. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reding et al. (US Patent Publication 2004/0156491 herein after referenced as Reding) in view of Mooney (US Patent 7363006 herein after referenced as Mooney).

Regarding claim 3, Reding discloses “A method according to claim 1, and according to the identified data transmitting device, the data is received in said receiving mobile station, or it is transmitted further to a predetermined other receiving device”
(Paragraph [0121] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses calls to their home phone from a particular user will ring the home phone, therefore receiving the data in the

received mobile station when the transmitting device is identified as the transmitting mobile station with a defined call divert command).

Reding fails to disclose “wherein the transmitting device, from which data is being transmitted to the receiving mobile station, is identified in the receiving mobile station before activating the data in the receiving mobile station.”

In a related field of endeavor, Mooney discloses “wherein the transmitting device, from which data is being transmitted to the receiving mobile station, is identified in the receiving mobile station before activating the data in the receiving mobile station.

(Column 5, Lines 15 – 22 of Mooney, wherein Mooney discloses the gateway cell phone comparing Caller-ID information with respect to an incoming call and determining if any of the terminals listed is allowed to remotely answer, therefore comparing the Caller-ID information and forwarding the call to the allowed terminals).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Reding to incorporate the teachings of Mooney of having the cell phone identify the transmitting mobile station for the purpose of saving network resources by reducing the complexity and the amount of signaling done in the back end.

15. Claims 5 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reding et al. (US Patent Publication 2004/0156491 herein after referenced as Reding) in view of LaPierre et al. (US Patent 6738466 herein after referenced as LaPierre).

Regarding claim 5, Reding discloses “A system according to claim 4, wherein said processor is configured to identify a device” (**Fig. 8 & Paragraphs [0040] & [0114] – [0115] of Reding**).

Reding fails to disclose “wherein said processor is configured to identify a previous device from which the data was last transmitted.”

In a similar field of endeavor, LaPierre discloses “wherein said processor is configured to identify a previous device from which the data was last transmitted” (**Column 5, Lines 1 – 7 of LaPierre, wherein LaPierre discloses the call identification information including the redirecting number is forwarded to the telephone station and wherein a caller identification unit identifies the number from which the call was redirected**).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Reding to incorporate the teachings of LaPierre for the purpose of identifying whether an incoming call has been redirected from another number and to which number the call was redirected from (**Column 1, Lines 49 – 53 of LaPierre**).

Regarding claim 19, Reding discloses “A mobile switching center according to claim 18, and for defining the receiving device according to an identified previous transmitter” (**Paragraph [0116] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses the disposition list specifying the calls from a calling party to be forwarded to a particular number**).

Reding fails to disclose “wherein the mobile switching center is able to look up in a network home register information for identifying a previous transmitter of data.”

In a similar field of endeavor, LaPierre discloses “wherein the center is able to look up in a network home register information for identifying a previous transmitter of the data” (**Column 5, Lines 1 – 7 of LaPierre, wherein LaPierre discloses the call identification information including the redirecting number is forwarded to the telephone station and wherein a caller identification unit identifies the number from which the call was redirected, therefore network home register information for identifying a previous transmitter**).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Reding to incorporate the teachings of LaPierre for the purpose of identifying whether an incoming call has been redirected from another number and to which number the call was redirected from (**Column 1, Lines 49 – 53 of LaPierre**).

Conclusion

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Mapa whose telephone number is (571)270-5540. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY TO THURSDAY 8:00AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nick Corsaro can be reached on (571)272-7876. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Mapa/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/NICK CORSARO/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617